

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 147520

66

ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 IO-10 ISO-00 SS-15 PM-03 ACDA-05 L-03 DODE-00

SSO-00 CIAE-00 INR-07 NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 USIE-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00 INRE-00 /066 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:JSDAVISON

APPROVED BY C:HSNENFELDT

EUR:AAHARTMAN

PM/DCA:DCAMITTA

ACDA:THIRSCHFELD

L/EUR:DSMALL

ISA:JWADE

JCS:BGEN.SSERIO

S/S: RKUCHEL

----- 016325

O R 232322Z JUN 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION GENEVA IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 147520

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR CSCE

SUBJECT: CSCE; CBMS:UK DRAFT FOR PACKAGE DEAL

REF; GENEVA 4669

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 147520

GENEVA FOR US CSCE DEL

FOLLOWING POINTS KEYED TO FOOTNOTES IN GENEVA 4669 WILL
SERVE AS GUIDANCE FOR JUNE 24 NATO CAUCUS DISCUSSION ON

UK PACKAGE DEAL TEXT ON CBMS:

1. WE HAVE NO STRONG PREFERENCE ABOUT ALTERNATIVE WORDING FOR CHAPTER HEADING AND YOU CAN ACCEPT WHATEVER COMPROMISE FRENCH AND OTHER ALLIES WORK OUT.

2. NO OBJECTION TO INCLUSION IN PREAMBULAR SENTENCE ON MANEUVERS ALONG THESE LINES.

3. WE SUPPORT UK APPROACH FOR INCLUSION SPECIFIC WORDS "VOLUNTARY BASIS" SOMEWHERE IN CBMS TEXT AS MOST LIKELY WAY OF MEETING WELL KNOWN SOVIET CONCERNS AND HOPE THAT DUTCH STICKINESS ON THIS POINT CAN BE OVERCOME.

4. WE PREFER INCLUSION OF WORD "RESOLUTIONS" WITH ADDITION OF PHRASE "BY WHICH THEY WILL BE GUIDED" WHICH SERVES PURPOSE OF CLARIFYING NATURE OF COMMITMENT RE IMPLEMENTATION OF CBMS. THIS IS OUR PREFERRED POSITION BECAUSE OF THE RANGE OF COMMITMENTS IN THE OPERATIVE VERBS IN THE PARAGRAPHS WHICH FOLLOW. WORD "RECOMMENDATIONS" WHICH SOVIETS PREFER ALSO WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE ALTHOUGH WE RECOGNIZE IT WOULD PROBABLY BE TOO WEAK FOR ALLIES. WE COULD ALSO ACCEPT COMBINATION OF "RESOLUTIONS" AND "RECOMMENDATIONS." IF STRONG CONSENSUS DEVELOPS IN FAVOR OF EITHER "RESOLUTIONS" OR "DECLARATIONS" ALONE, WE COULD LIVE WITH THIS. WE OPPOSE ENDING PHRASE WITH "THE FOLLOWING."

5. WE CAN ACCEPT PLACEMENT OF "VOLUNTARY BASIS" IN PREAMBLE, MINI-PREAMBLE OR IN OPERATIVE TEXT. ASSUME THE PLACEMENT OF THIS THOUGHT WILL BE KEY ELEMENT IN FUTURE BARGAINING WITH SOVIETS AND HOPE THAT ALLIES WILL REMAIN FLEXIBLE ABOUT POSITION OF THIS LANGUAGE AS DISCUSSIONS WITH SOVIETS ON MANEUVER PARAMETERS CONTINUE. WE CAN ALSO ACCEPT SOVIET SUGGESTION FOR MINOR CHANGES IN UK PREAMBULAR TEXT (GENEVA 3773) AND YOU SHOULD ENCOURAGE ALLIES TO DO LIKEWISE. WE AGREE THAT "HAVE DECIDED" CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 147520

POSES SIGNIFICANT LEGAL PROBLEMS.

6. ENTIRE SENTENCE SHOULD BE DROPPED AND OTHER MORE ACCEPTABLE FORMULATION FOUND.

7. ALTHOUGH WE CONTINUE TO PREFER APPROACH IN STATE 139914 PARAGRAPH 2, TURKISH APPROACH IS ACCEPTABLE, I.E., "NOTIFICATION WILL BE GIVEN OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS INVOLVING TROOPS TOGETHER WITH ANY POSSIBLE AIR OR NAVAL COMPONENTS, IN PARTICULAR, AMPHIBIOUS FORCES, IN WHICH ANY PARTICIPATING STATE IS ENGAGED." WE HAVE PROBLEM WITH CANADIAN ADDITION SINCE IT DOES NOT EXCLUDE NOTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT AIR OR NAVAL MANEUVERS.

8. RE THRESHOLD FOR COMBINED LAND MANEUVERS INVOLVING AMPHIBIOUS FORCES, YOU MAY INDICATE THAT WE SUPPORT TURKISH APPROACH SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS MENTIONED BY DELEGATION IN REFTEL, FOOTNOTE NO. 8.

9. NO GUIDANCE REQUIRED. HOWEVER, IN PARAGRAPH WHICH FOLLOWS DEALING WITH EXCEPTIONS FOR STATES WHOSE TERRITORY EXTEND BEYOND EUROPE, WE HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH WORD "FRONTIER." FRONTIER REFERS TO LAND AREAS ONLY; MOREOVER, IT CAN BE EITHER A LINE OR A ZONE. IN ORDER TO INCLUDE BOTH LAND AND SEA BORDERS, THE BEST

FORMULATION IS "STATE BOUNDARY." IF NECESSARY, "BOUNDARY" ALONE IS ACCEPTABLE. IF RUSSIAN AND OTHER LANGUAGE VERSIONS OF THIS TEXT USE WORDS WHICH INCORPORATE BOTH LAND AND SEA BORDERS, AND NEGOTIATING RECORD MAKES CLEAR THAT "FRONTIERS" ALSO REFERS TO LAND AND SEA BORDERS, WE COULD ACCEPT THIS TERM.

10. YOU SHOULD CONTINUE LETTING UK AND OTHERS TAKE LEAD WITH TURKS ON TURKEY AREA PROBLEM NOTING AS APPROPRIATE THAT WE LIKE PARAGRAPH OF UK DRAFT DEALING WITH ISSUES OF USSR WESTERN AND BALTIC FRONTIERS AND WOULD SUPPORT SUGGESTION OF UK, FRG, NORWAY AND CANADA FOR HANDLING OF TURKISH PROBLEM "PRIOR NOTIFICATION NEED NOT BE GIVEN OF MANEUVERS WHICH TAKE PLACE CLOSE TO ANY FRONTIERS WHICH PARTICIPATING STATES MAY SHARE WITH CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 147520

NON-PARTICIPATING STATES."

11. NO OBJECTION TO PHRASE "AT LEAST" FOR NOTIFICATION, ASSUMING THAT PHRASE "AT LEAST" COULD BE TRADED AWAY IN LATER NEGOTIATIONS WITH SOVIETS.

12. NO OBJECTION.

13. WE CAN ACCEPT UK FORMULATION RE NOTIFICATION OF "OTHER MILITARY MANEUVERS." REFERENCE TO "MANEUVERS IN OTHER AREAS" WOULD BE UNACCEPTABLE. NOTIFICATION AREA HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED IN TEXT ON NOTIFYING MAJOR MANEUVERS, AND WE BELIEVE AREA DEFINITION SHOULD NOT BE BLURRED BY DIFFERENT FORMULATION.

14. NO OBJECTION.

15. NO GUIDANCE REQUIRED.

16. NO GUIDANCE REQUIRED.

17. NO GUIDANCE REQUIRED.

18. IN ACCORDANCE WITH GUIDANCE IN STATE 10050 IN WHICH WE INDICATED THAT WE COULD NOT STAND IN WAY OF ALLIES EXPLORING BILATERALLY A MORE FORTHCOMING POSITION ON MOVEMENTS WITH SOVIETS, YOU MAY INFORM CAUCUS THAT WE WILL NOT OPPOSE INCLUSION OF DISCRETIONARY MOVEMENTS NOTIFICATION IN PAPER TO BE PRESENTED TO SOVIETS, JUNE 27. WE ASSUME UK WILL NOT PRESENT DISCRETIONARY NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS TO SOVIETS ON A "TAKE IT OR

LEAVE IT" BASIS AND EXPECT THAT ALLIES WILL BE MORE ACTIVE IN EXPLORING COMPROMISE WITH SOVIETS ON MOVEMENTS ISSUE ONCE THE UK PAPER HAS BEEN PRESENTED.

19. NO FURTHER GUIDANCE.

20. NO FURTHER GUIDANCE.

21. NO FURTHER GUIDANCE.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 147520

22. PREFER SUBSTITUTE "TENSION" FOR "MILITARY CONFRONTATION." WOULD HOPE ALSO THAT PHRASE "ARMS CONTROL" WHICH WE HAVE LONG FAVORED AS AN ELEMENT OF THIS TEXT COULD BE INCLUDED IN LINE THREE -- I.E., "THE PARTICIPATING STATES RECOGNIZING THE INTEREST OF ALL OF THEM IN EFFORTS AIMED AT LESSENING TENSION AND PROMOTING ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT..." ALSO, THOROUGHOUT UK TEXT WE WOULD PREFER WHEREVER WORD "DISARMAMENT" OCCURS IT BE PRECEDED BY WORDS "ARMS CONTROL." INGERSOLL

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 26 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: CBMS, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, AGREEMENT DRAFT, TEXT
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 23 JUN 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE147520
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: EUR/RPM:JSDAVISON
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: D750218-0417
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197506102/baaaankc.tel
Line Count: 197
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 10 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <10 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <22 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: n/a
TAGS: PFOR, PARM, XG, CSCE
To: GENEVA INFO NATO
MOSCOW
VIENNA
LONDON
ANKARA
PARIS

BONN
THE HAGUE

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006